

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

John L. Jackson, #227240;)	C.A. No. 6:08-599-TLW-WMC
)	
Petitioner;)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Willie L. Eagleton;)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

The Petitioner, proceeding *pro se*, brings this action seeking habeas relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On May 21, 2008, the Respondent moved for summary judgment on Petitioner's claims. The Petitioner responded on June 25, 2008. On February 2, 2009, United States Magistrate Judge William Catoe, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), filed a Report and Recommendation ("the Report"). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Catoe recommends that the Respondent's motion for summary judgment be granted. On February 17, 2009, Petitioner filed a "Motion to Expand Records and Extension of Time." Petitioner was granted an extension to file objections to the Report. On March 19, 2009, Petitioner filed objections to the Magistrate's Report.

This Court is charged with reviewing the Magistrate's Report and the Plaintiff's objections thereto. In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However,

the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 25); and Respondent's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. # 12).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

March 23, 2009
Florence, South Carolina